



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Kalinski was advised that this application is subject to an obviousness-type double patenting rejection over the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,962,263. Although the claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patented claims show all the structure of the device. A terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321 was needed to overcome the double patenting rejection.